

education, or humanize toil—is precisely the point on which it is needed to throw light. It must be based on some conception of the requirements of human nature as a whole, to which the satisfaction of economic needs is evidently vital, but which demands the satisfaction of other needs as well, and which can organize its activities on a rational system only in so far as it has a clear apprehension of their relative significance. " Whatever the world thinks/' wrote Bishop Berkeley, " he who hath not much meditated upon God, the human mind and the *summum bonum*, may possibly make a thriving earthworm, but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman." The philosopher of to-day, who bids us base our hopes of progress on knowledge inspired by love, does not differ from the Bishop so much, perhaps, as he would wish. The most obvious facts are the most easily forgotten. Both the existing economic order, and too many of the projects advanced for reconstructing it, break down through their neglect of the truism that, since even quite common men have souls, no increase in material wealth will compensate them for arrangements which insult their self-respect and impair their freedom. A reasonable estimate of economic organization must allow for the fact that, unless industry is to be paralysed by recurrent revolts on

the part of
outraged human nature, it must satisfy
criteria which
are not purely economic. A reasonable
view of its
possible modifications must recognize that
natural appetites may be purified or restrained, as, in
fact, in some
considerable measure they already have
been, by being
submitted to the control of some larger body
of interests.
The distinction made by the philosophers of
classical antiquity between liberal and servile
occupations,
the mediaeval insistence that riches exist for
man, not
man for riches, Ruskin's famous outburst,
"there is
no wealth but life/" the argument of the
Socialist who
urges that production should be organized
for service,